arXiv:1412.8181v1 [quant-ph] 28 Dec 2014

STATES THAT ARE FAR FROM BEING STABILIZER STATES

David Andersson*

Ingemar Bengtsson*

Kate Blanchfield*

Hoan Bui Dang**

*Fysikum, Stockholms Universitet, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
**Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics and University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Abstract:

Stabilizer states are eigenvectors of maximal commuting sets of operators in a finite Heisenberg group. States that are far from being stabilizer states include magic states in quantum computation, MUB-balanced states, and SIC vectors. In prime dimensions the latter two fall under the umbrella of Minimum Uncertainty States (MUS) in the sense of Wootters and Sussman. We study the correlation between two ways in which the notion of "far from being a stabilizer state" can be quantified, and give detailed results for low dimensions. In dimension 7 we identify the MUB-balanced states as being antipodal to the SIC vectors within the set of MUS, in a sense that we make definite. In dimension 4 we show that the states that come closest to being MUS with respect to all the six stabilizer MUBs are the fiducial vectors for Alltop MUBs.

1. Introduction

At the outset all vectors in a given Hilbert space are on the same footing, but in physics it frequently happens that a particular group of transformations is singled out for attention. Then the vectors are distinguished from each other by what the group does to them. In this paper we will look at a particularly interesting choice of the group—namely, finite Heisenberg groups. Once this choice is made an entire fauna of states springs into existence: stabilizer states, stabilizer MUBs, magic states, Alltop MUBs, MUB-balanced states, SICs, and more. Our concern is to see how they relate to each other.

A stabilizer state, by definition, is an eigenvector of a maximal abelian subgroup of a finite Heisenberg group. In a certain sense—very much so in some yet-to-be-built quantum computers—stabilizer states play the role of "classical" states [1, 2].

We let the acronym MUB stand for a complete set of $d+1$ mutually unbiased bases in dimension d. To see how they arise, note that finite Heisenberg groups are represented in d dimensions by d^2 operators (not counting phase factors), and that these operators provide unitary operator bases in any dimension d. When a unitary operator basis can be split into $d+1$ disjoint sets of $d-1$ commuting operators (the unit element apart) we say that it forms a flower. The disjoint sets of commuting operators are its petals. In prime dimensions the Weyl-Heisenberg group defines a unique flower. In prime power dimensions the multipartite Heisenberg group can be displayed as a flower in more than one way. There are no flowers if the dimension is not a prime power, for any version of the Heisenberg group. When it exists, a flower provides a powerful organizing principle for Hilbert space. In fact the eigenbases of its petals form a MUB [3]. Since the individual vectors are stabilizer states we refer to such a MUB as a stabilizer MUB.

Magic states have an operational definition in universal fault-tolerant quantum computation [4]. We do not give it here, we just observe that, in prime dimensions, one interesting class of magic states [5, 6] is provided by vectors in the Alltop MUBs [7, 8, 9]. Such vectors belong to an orbit of the Weyl-Heisenberg group forming d MU bases, all of which are unbiased to one of the bases in the stabilizer MUB. We refer to the vectors in such an orbit as Alltop vectors. The Alltop MUBs are unitarily equivalent to stabilizer MUBs, but from the point of view of the Heisenberg group the Alltop vectors are very different from the stabilizer vectors. The latter are "classical", the former are "non-classical".

A SIC is a set of d^2 unit vectors such that the absolute values squared of the mutual scalar products are always equal to $1/(d+1)$. That is, it is an equiangular tight frame [10, 11]. This definition turns out to be very deep mathematically, and the existence of SIC vectors in all dimensions is conjectural only [12, 13]. A few exceptions apart it seems that SICs always arise as orbits of the Weyl-Heisenberg group. This is known for a fact in dimensions 2 and 3 [15]. If $d = 2$ the SIC vectors also serve as magic states [4]. Whatever the dimension the SIC vectors are in a definite sense at the other end of the spectrum from the stabilizer states (for which each individual basis in a MUB is an orbit under the Weyl-Heisenberg group).

To define the MUB-balanced states we need a few equations. Given $d+1$ orthonormal bases $\{|e_i^{(z)}\rangle\}_{i=0}^{d-1}$, we define the $d+1$ probability vectors $\vec{p}_{(z)}$ with components determined by the state vector $|\psi\rangle$ through

$$p_{i,(z)} = |\langle e_i^{(z)}|\psi\rangle|^2 \ . \tag{1}$$

Here $0 \leq z \leq d$ labels the $d+1$ bases in a MUB, and i labels the individual elements in such a basis. One can prove that [16]

$$\sum_{z=0}^{d} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} p_{i,(z)}^2 = 2 \ . \tag{2}$$

Wootters and Sussman [17] defined a Minimum Uncertainty State (MUS) as one for which

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} p_{i,(z)}^2 = \frac{2}{d+1} \ , \tag{3}$$

for every MU basis individually. Now consider a state as a vector in Bloch space, the set of unit trace Hermitean matrices with its origin at the maximally mixed state. A probability vector arises, as in eq. (1), from an orthogonal projection of a Bloch vector to a plane spanned by the states in a Hilbert space basis. Then eq. (2) follows from Pythagoras' theorem and eqs. (3) mean that the length of the Bloch vector when projected orthogonally onto the plane defined by a MU basis is independent of which basis we pick [18]. It is understood that the MUB with respect to which the MUS is defined is a stabilizer MUB, and then we see that there is a sense—at least in prime dimensions, where the stabilizer MUB is unique—in which a MUS is indeed far from being a stabilizer state. In a Hilbert space of dimension d,

one expects the set of MUS to form a continuous set of real dimension $d-2$, while the set of all pure states has real dimension $2d-2$.

A MUB-balanced state is defined as one for which the $d+1$ probability vectors $\vec{p}_z$ are identical up to permutations of their components [19]. Such states form a distinguished discrete set inside the continuous set of MUS. They can arise as eigenvectors of a MUB cycling operators, operators that cycle through all the $d+1$ bases in a MUB. MUB-balanced states are known to exist if $d = 2^n$ where unitary MUB-cyclers exist [17, 20], and if $d = (\text{prime})^n = 3$ modulo 4 where anti-unitary MUB-cyclers exist [19, 21]. These states have some intriguing and useful properties [19, 21, 22]. For odd d the parity of these states (in the language used in connection with discrete Wigner functions, say) is opposite to that of the stabilizer states, and there is a sense in which this property alone makes them far from being stabilizer states: they maximally violate a certain non-contextuality inequality used to demarcate states that behave "classically" in quantum computing [23].

Interestingly, if they exist, and if the dimension of Hilbert space is a prime number, the SIC vectors form another distinguished discrete subset of the set of MUS [24]. In fact this was the first concrete hint (out of three [25, 27]) of a connection between MUBs and SICs in prime dimensions larger than 3. To complete the story we mention that another interesting notion of "far from being a stabilizer state" is that of maximal mana states [28]. These are SIC vectors if $d = 2, 3$ but if $d = 5$ they are not even MUS [29]. They will not be discussed here.

In the next section we introduce quantitative measures of how far a given state is from being a MUS, and how far it is from being a Weyl-Heisenberg covariant SIC. We also derive an inequality, relating these measures in prime dimensions. Then we study the correlation between them, and see where MUB-balanced states and Alltop vectors fit into the resulting picture. This is mostly done numerically, beginning with the prime dimensions $d = 2$, 3, 5, 7. We make an aside on "Zauner subspaces" (of interest in the SIC existence problem [10]). Finally we come to $d = 4$, where the question of the correlation between the measure of MUSness relative to two different stabilizer MUBs arises. By the time we formulate our conclusions, in section 7, the beginnings of an orderly pattern for the states we discuss will have emerged.

2. Quantitative measures, and an inequality

In any dimension d the Weyl-Heisenberg group $H(d)$ is generated by two elements X and Z which in themselves generate cyclic subgroups of order d, and obey

$$ZX = \omega XZ \ , \tag{4}$$

where $\omega = e^{2\pi i/d}$. Once the generator Z is given in diagonal form the unitary representation is unique. One finds that

$$Z|e_i\rangle = \omega^i |e_i\rangle \ , \qquad X|e_i\rangle = |e_{i+1}\rangle \ , \tag{5}$$

where integers modulo d are used to label the states. In odd prime dimensions it is convenient to work with the d^2 displacement operators

$$D_{ij} = \omega^{\frac{1}{2}ij} X^i Z^j \ , \tag{6}$$

where $1/2$ is the multiplicative inverse of 2 modulo d. The full story can be found in many places, say in ref. [12].

We define

$$f_{\rm SIC}(\psi) = \sum_{(i,j)\neq(0,0)} \left(|\langle\psi|D_{ij}|\psi\rangle|^2 - \frac{1}{d+1} \right)^2 \ . \tag{7}$$

This octic expression in the components of the unit vector $|\psi\rangle$ is also known as a frame potential [30], and is familiar from the study of 2-designs, except that we rescaled and then shifted it so that $f_{\rm SIC} = 0$ if and only if $|\psi\rangle$ is a SIC vector. The SIC itself is obtained by acting on such a vector with all the displacement operators—the absolute values squared of all the scalar products equal $1/(d+1)$ in this case.

Given a MUB, with bases labelled by z, we also define

$$f_{\rm MUS}(\psi) = \sum_{z=0}^{d} \left(\sum_{r=0}^{d-1} |\langle e_r^{(z)}|\psi\rangle|^4 - \frac{2}{d+1} \right)^2 \ . \tag{8}$$

This function is again an octic polynomial, and it vanishes if and only if $|\psi\rangle$ is a MUS, as defined in the introduction.

In prime dimensions these two measures are related by the inequality

$$f_{\rm SIC} \geq \frac{d^2}{d-1} f_{\rm MUS} \ , \tag{9}$$

with equality for all states if and only if $d = 2, 3$. For $d = 2$ it is easy to show by means of an explicit calculation that equality holds. Now let d be an odd prime. The idea of the proof is to split $f_{\rm SIC}$ into $d+1$ terms, one for each petal. Focus on one such maximal abelian subgroup, denote its generator by Z, and diagonalize. In this basis $|\psi\rangle$ is

$$\psi = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{p_0} \\ \sqrt{p_1} e^{i\mu_1} \\ \vdots \\ \sqrt{p_{d-1}} e^{i\mu_{d-1}} \end{pmatrix} \ , \qquad p_i \geq 0 \ , \quad \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} p_i = 1 \ . \tag{10}$$

The calculation is exactly the same in all the $d+1$ eigenbases. Therefore it will be enough to show that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \left(|\langle\psi|Z^j|\psi\rangle|^2 - \frac{1}{d+1} \right)^2 \geq \frac{d^2}{d-1} \left(\sum_{r=0}^{d-1} p_r^2 - \frac{2}{d+1} \right)^2 \ . \tag{11}$$

Using the standard representation of Z we observe that

$$|\langle\psi|Z^j|\psi\rangle|^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} p_k^2 + \sum_{k\neq l} \omega^{j(k-l)} p_k p_l = \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} p_k^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\frac{d-1}{2}} (\omega^{jk} + \omega^{-jk}) \Delta_k \ , \tag{12}$$

where

$$\Delta_k = \sum_{m=0}^{d-1} p_m p_{m+k} \ . \tag{13}$$

After an amount of manipulation we find that the inequality (11) holds if and only if

$$(d-1) \sum_{k=1}^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \Delta_k^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} p_k^2 \right)^2 = 2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \Delta_k \right)^2 \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\frac{d-1}{2}}\sum_{l=1}^{\frac{d-1}{2}}(\Delta_k^2+\Delta_l^2) \geq 2\sum_{k=1}^{\frac{d-1}{2}}\sum_{l=1}^{\frac{d-1}{2}}\Delta_k\Delta_l \qquad (14)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\frac{d-1}{2}}\sum_{l=1}^{\frac{d-1}{2}}(\Delta_k-\Delta_l)^2 \geq 0 \ ,$$

and we are done. It is clear that equality holds for all probability vectors if and only if $d = 3$. In higher dimensions more than one distinct Δ_k may occur.

States that saturate the inequality have an interesting geometrical property. Let such a state serve as the fiducial state in a Weyl-Heisenberg orbit. In Bloch space, project the d^2 (pure) density matrices in the orbit orthogonally onto the plane spanned by an eigenbasis of a cyclic subgroup, that is to a plane defined by a MU basis. Denote the generator of this cyclic subgroup with Z. When this generator acts on a state it does not affect its image under the projection. Thus only d distinct points will appear when we project the entire orbit. Denote the complementary generator with X. Its effect on the projection is to permute the entries of the probability vector cyclically, $p_i \rightarrow p_{i-1}$. The state saturates the inequality if and only if Δ_k takes the same value for all k, for all eigenbases. But the Δ_k are precisely the mutual scalar products of the probability vectors. Hence the d projections of the orbit sit at the vertices of a regular simplex for such a fiducial state. The same argument applies to all the $d + 1$ eigenbases.

SIC vectors do saturate the inequality for all prime dimensions, and being MUS they have the additional property that all the simplices we see in the $d + 1$ projections are of the same size [18, 24]. Alltop vectors also saturate the inequality as one can see from a formula given by Khaterinejad [31], and they have the additional property that d out of $d + 1$ projected simplices share the same size and the same orientation, as follows from the fact that every Alltop vector is left invariant by a unitary operator that cycles through d of the bases in the stabilizer MUB [9]. A glance at Fig. 1 may clarify this description.

Table 1 gives some precise information. For comparison it is also useful to know that the Fubini-Study averages over all Hilbert space are [32]

Table 1: Some states that saturate the inequality (d is prime)

States	$f_{\rm MUS}$	$f_{\rm SIC}$	Remark
Stabilizer states	$\frac{(d-1)^2}{d(d+1)}$	$\frac{d(d-1)}{d+1}$	classical states
Alltop vectors	$\frac{(d-1)^2}{d^3(d+1)}$	$\frac{d-1}{d(d+1)}$	magic states
SIC vectors	0	0	mysterious states

$$\langle f_{\rm SIC}\rangle_{\rm FS} = \begin{cases} \frac{d(d-1)}{(d+2)(d+1)} \text{ if } d \text{ is odd} \\ \\ \frac{d^2}{(d+3)(d+1)} \text{ if } d \text{ is even} \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

$$\langle f_{\rm MUS}\rangle_{\rm FS} = \frac{4(d-1)}{(d+3)(d+2)(d+1)} \ . \tag{16}$$

The latter tends to zero with growing dimension, as is reasonable.

3. Dimensions 2 and 3

From the previous section it is clear that in dimensions 2 and 3 every Minimum Uncertainty State is a SIC vector (and the converse holds [14, 15]). In dimension 2 it is also true that each of the eight MUS is MUB-balanced.

In 3 dimensions it is known that every Weyl-Heisenberg covariant SIC is equivalent (to be precise, equivalent under the extended Clifford group [12]) to one obtained from a fiducial vector with components [10]

$$\psi(\sigma) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ -e^{i\sigma} \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{17}$$

where $\sigma \in [0, 2\pi/6]$. This is a MUB-balanced state if and only if $\sigma = 0$, and incidentally a maximal mana state if $\sigma = 0$ or $2\pi/6$ [28]. Since all states in these dimensions saturate the inequality (9) we see regular triangles in all projections of every Weyl-Heisenberg orbit onto the MU planes, but they have the same size if and only if the fiducial vector is a SIC. See Fig. 1.



Figure 1: For $d = 3$ we show the orthogonal projections of the 9 vectors in a Weyl-Heisenberg orbit onto the four MUB simplices. It is always the case that three images coincide, so we see only 3 points in each projection. From top to bottom we see a MUB-balanced SIC, a generic SIC, an Alltop orbit, and an orbit whose fiducial vector is a random state.

4. Dimensions 5 and 7

In dimensions 5 and 7 we begin by choosing vectors at random, computing the values that $f_{\rm SIC}$ and $f_{\rm MUS}$ take for them, and plotting the results. See Figs. 2 and 3. The results look rather similar for these two dimensions (and we have checked that they continue to look similar for $d = 11$, 13, 17, and 19, although our coverage in higher dimensions is not very good). In particular, all the points fall inside a region whose boundary consists of four segments. One of them is the simplex line, where the inequality (9) is saturated. It gets its name from the geometric interpretation in section 2. It begins at the origin (where the SIC vectors sit) and ends at the stabilizer states. There it joins a curved segment, and we have convinced ourselves that the states that end up on this segment consist of superpositions of two orthogonal stabilizer states. This segment ends at a point where the superposition is of equal weight,



Figure 2: The correlation between SICness and MUSness in dimension 5. The plot uses $6 \cdot 10^5$ vectors, chosen in equal numbers at random, close to a stabilizer vector, and close to a SIC vector.

and is then joined by another segment that we have not understood. Finally Minimum Uncertainty States form the segment that lies on the vertical axis.

One obvious distinguished point in the plots is given by Minimum Uncertainty States that maximize $f_{\rm SIC}$, given that $f_{\rm MUS} = 0$. We identified this point using the NMaximize routine in Mathematica. When $d = 5$ we find states that we do not recognize. However, when $d = 7$ we do recognize them. They are MUB-balanced states. Such states exist when d is an even prime power [17] or an odd prime power equal to 3 modulo 4 [19, 21], but at least conjecturally not otherwise. We find it somewhat remarkable that these states are "antipodal" to the SIC vectors within the set of Minimum Uncertainty States.

To be precise, the numerical calculation shows that, when $d = 7$,

$$f_{\rm MUS} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 \le f_{\rm SIC} \le \frac{7}{8} \, . \tag{18}$$

We do not have an analytical proof of this statement, and we do not have a proof that all MUS with $f_{\rm SIC} = 7/8$ are indeed MUB-balanced, but we generated 26 such states numerically by maximizing $f_{\rm SIC}$ under the constraint $f_{\rm MUS} = 0$, and the statement was true in all cases. This result does not



Figure 3: The correlation between SICness and MUSness in dimension 7. The plot uses $8 \cdot 10^5$ vectors, chosen in equal numbers at random, close to a stabilizer vector, close to a SIC vector, and close to a MUB-balanced state.

seem to generalize to any higher dimension. In dimension 11 we numerically generated one vector maximizing f_{SIC} under the constraint $f_{\mathrm{MUS}} = 0$. The resulting vector obeys the constraint to a precision of 10^{-20}, but it has a value of f_{SIC} which is more than twice as large as that attained by the MUB-balanced states in this dimension. With less precision we also generated a MUS state in dimension 19 whose f_{SIC} value exceeds that of the MUB-balanced states there.

As mentioned in the introduction, MUB-balanced states in odd prime dimensions d have negative parity. There are d^2 negative parity eigenspaces altogether, related by the Weyl-Heisenberg group, and each negative parity eigenspace contains $d(d-1)/2$ MUB-balanced states [21]. The orthogonality relations between them form interesting patterns, shown for the 21 vectors we can find in $d = 7$ in Fig. 4.

We find it interesting that we encountered MUB-balanced states in dimension 7 but not in dimension 5, and that the states we did find in dimension 7 were among those already known (which can be constructed as eigenvectors of MUB-cycling anti-unitaries belonging to the extended Clifford group [19, 21]). We regard this as circumstantial evidence for the conjecture that all states of this kind have been identified already.



Figure 4: Orthogonality graph for the 21 MUB balanced states in a negative parity eigenspace in dimension 7. Technically this is a vertex transitive and perfect graph.

5. A look at Zauner subspaces

This section is an aside partly motivated by an unexplained property shared by every Weyl-Heisenberg covariant SIC so far constructed [13], namely that—as conjectured by Zauner [10]—every vector in such an orbit is left invariant by an element of the unitary automorphism group of the Weyl-Heisenberg group, having order 3. Thus they sit in special subspaces, known as Zauner subspaces. This section is also motivated by a naive question: what do the level surfaces of the function $f_{\rm SIC}$ actually look like?

Unfortunately the dimension of the Hilbert space is typically too large for visualization. However, if the Hilbert space has dimensions 4 or 5 the Zauner subspace has dimension 2 only, and this can be visualized as a Bloch sphere. The resulting pictures of $f_{\rm SIC}$ are quite complex [26], which begins to explain why finding SIC vectors using numerical methods is a difficult art [13]. When $d = 5$ the one-parameter family of Minimum Uncertainty States in the Zauner subspace can be solved for exactly [26].

In Hilbert space of dimension 7 the Zauner subspace is three dimensional but contains a real subspace of considerable interest, and this real subspace defines a two dimensional real projective space. Fig. 5 is a map of the real Zauner subspace in dimension 7, making use of the fact that real projective 2-space can be viewed as a sphere with antipodal points identified, or equivalently as the upper hemisphere of a sphere. Stereographic coordinates are



Figure 5: Stereographic projection of a hemisphere, or equivalently of the real subspace of the Zauner subspace, in dimension 7. The positions of 6 Alltop vectors (at latitude 22°) and 6 MUS states (at latitude 42°) are shown against a background of contour curves for f_{SIC}. Maxima ($f_{\mathrm{SIC}} = 5.24$) occur at two eigenvectors of the Weyl-Heisenberg group (one of them sits at the pole), there are several local minima, and nothing special happens at the MUS states unless they are also SIC vectors (as happens for two out of six).

used. By solving the polynomial equations that define Minimum Uncertainty States we have verified that there are exactly 6 such states within this real subspace. They are marked on the map. Only two of them are SIC vectors [12]. Interestingly this subspace also contains 6 Alltop vectors, with a specific value of f_{SIC}, and their position are given as well. In fact Alltop vectors will occur in the analogous subspace in all prime dimensions $d = 1$ modulo 3 [27], while SIC vectors occur there only in a few cases [31].

6. Dimension 4

Since 4 is a prime power we have a choice between two non-isomorphic Heisenberg groups when $d = 4$. The one having a SIC as an orbit is the usual Weyl-Heisenberg group $H(4)$, while the one underlying the mutually unbiased bases is the bipartite direct product $H(2) \times H(2)$. In fact the bipartite group admits 15 maximal abelian subgroups having altogether 60 stabilizer states as eigenvectors. The latter can be organized into stabilizer MUBs in

6 different but unitarily equivalent ways. This well known situation is summarized in Fig. 6, and elsewhere [33]. Since the SIC in this dimension is covariant under $H(4)$, and no canonical identification of the computational bases of the two groups is known, it plays no role in this paper.



Figure 6: The 15 edges of the complete 6-graph are the bases defined by altogether 15 maximal abelian subgroups. The vertices are MUBs. The 5 edges meeting at a vertex represent the bases in that MUB. On the left: In the computational basis 6 bases are maximally entangled, and they are drawn in black. On the right: the computational basis is drawn in black, 8 bases form Hadamard matrices, and 6 form sparse matrices drawn in white.

Minimum Uncertainty States, and the function $f_{\rm MUS}$, can be defined relative to any MUB. In dimension 4 we have 6 stabilizer MUBs to choose from. The definition of the frame function $f_{\rm SIC}$ can be used in dimension 4 provided it is modified so that the sum in eq. (7) runs over the non-trivial elements of the bipartite Heisenberg group. We have checked that the inequality (9) with $d = 4$ holds in this case too, and that the maximum of these functions is attained by the vectors in the relevant MUB. To be precise, for the six different cases in which $f_{\rm MUS}$ can be defined it is true that

$$f_{\rm SIC} \geq \frac{16}{3} f_{\rm MUS} \ . \tag{19}$$

The bound can be saturated. Moreover there holds, in general, that

$$0 < f_{\rm SIC} \leq \frac{12}{5} \ . \tag{20}$$

The upper bound is saturated by the stabilizer states, but this time the lower bound cannot be reached because the bipartite Heisenberg group does not admit a SIC as an orbit. A plot is shown in Fig. 7.



Figure 7: The correlation between the SICness and MUSness in dimension 4. The plot uses $5 \cdot 10^5$ random vectors. For stabilizer states it matters whether they belong to the MUB with respect to which f_{MUS} is defined. *Mutatis mutandis* this applies to the Alltop vectors too.

There are MUB-balanced states in $d = 4$, and when the MUB is a stabilizer MUB they can be constructed as eigenvectors of an element in the Clifford group of order 5 [17]. Such unitaries cycle through the bases in one of the MUBs, and they move bases in one of the other five MUBs through these five. Since there are six MUBs altogether we are in fact dealing with six different MUS-functions $f^{(i)}_{\mathrm{MUS}}$, where i labels the particular MUB with respect to which the functions are defined. A MUB-balanced state is a MUS only with respect to one of them. If the state is balanced with respect to the first MUB one finds

$$f_{\mathrm{SIC}} = 0.32 \ , \qquad f^{(1)}_{\mathrm{MUS}} = 0 \ , \qquad f^{(2)}_{\mathrm{MUS}} = \ldots = f^{(6)}_{\mathrm{MUS}} = 0.032 \ . \tag{21}$$

Judging from Fig. 7 these are not very remarkable values.

A new question is now posing itself, because we can ask for the correlation between two different MUS-functions $f^{(i)}_{\mathrm{MUS}}$. This results in the stingray shown in Fig. 8. Inspection of this plot may suggest the possibility of finding a state which is MUS relative to two stabilizer MUBs, but in fact no such states exist. Still there will exist states that minimize the sum of the six



Figure 8: The correlation between the MUSness as defined with respect to any two different MUBs. The plot uses $5 \cdot 10^5$ random vectors.

different functions f_{MUS} that we obtain from the six stabilizer MUBs. In this very sense, these states deserve to be regarded as being as far from stabilizer states as any state can be.

We used Matlab to minimize, numerically, the sum of the f_{MUS}-functions for between 1 and 6 stabilizer MUBs. 10 000 random initializations were used in each case. The results are reported in Table 2.

We find that the states that minimize the sum over 4 or more f_{MUS} have the property that if we act on them with the bipartite Heisenberg group the resulting orbits form sets of four mutually unbiased bases. Therefore these states are fiducial vectors for Alltop MUBs. Each orbit forms a MUB when taken together with one of the 15 stabilizer bases. Using an exact expression for such fiducials [9] we find that

$$f_{\text{MUS}} = \begin{cases} \frac{9}{320} \approx 0.0281 & \text{if the Alltop and stabilizer MUBs share a basis} \\ \frac{3}{640} \approx 0.0047 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

Since the stabilizer basis to which the Alltop orbit is unbiased occurs in two

Table 2: Minimizing the MUSness with respect to more than one MUB.

Number of MUBs	minimum$\left(\sum f_{\rm MUS}^{(i)}\right)$
1	0.0000000000
2	0.0041666666
3	0.0102012357
4	0.0187500000
5	0.0468749999
6	0.0749999999

out of the four stabilizer MUBs (see Fig. 6) it follows that the minimum of $f_{\rm MUS}$ summed over all six stabilizer MUBs is

$$\min\left(\sum_{i=1}^{6} f_{\rm MUS}^{(i)}\right) = 4\cdot\frac{3}{640} + 2\cdot\frac{9}{320} = \frac{3}{40} = 0.075\ , \tag{23}$$

in agreement with the table. We conclude that there is a definite sense in which the prize for being as far as possible from the stabilizer states in $d = 4$ goes to the Alltop vectors.

Interestingly, the Alltop vectors also minimize $f_{\rm SIC}$ as defined using the bipartite Heisenberg group. We have not proved that this is the case, but it emerges clearly from Fig. 7. To remove any doubt we performed a numerical minimization of $f_{\rm SIC}$. We made 1000 trials and ended up, each time, with vectors having the values of $f_{\rm SIC}$ and $f_{\rm MUS}$ that obtain for the Alltop vectors.

It is perhaps worth noticing that the situation in dimension 8 must be different, since there does exist a SIC covariant under $H(2)\times H(2)\times H(2)$ in this dimension [34]. But this is an exceptional case [35].

7. Conclusions

We have walked through woods inhabited by states classified by a Heisenberg group into stabilizer states, Alltop vectors, MUB-balanced states, SIC vectors, and more. The stabilizer states are peaceful "classical" states from the point of view of some quantum computers, while the others are "wild" and in some sense essentially quantum.

Things are fairly simple in dimension 3 where every Minimum Uncertainty State is a SIC, one of which is composed of MUB-balanced states. In dimension 5 MUB-balanced states presumably do not exist, but in dimension 7 they do, and turn out to be—in a sense we made precise—antipodal to the SIC vectors within the set of Minimum Uncertainty States. We regard the results reported here as circumstantial evidence that the set of all MUB-balanced states coincides with the set of those that are already known [17, 19, 21].

In dimension 4 an interlocking system of six MUBs can be constructed from the stabilizer states. We find a clear sense in which the Alltop vectors are the states that are as far from being stabilizer states, and as close to being SIC vectors under the relevant group, as any state can be.

With the caveat that most of our discussion has been confined to low dimensions, we believe that we have introduced a certain amount of order into the question of providing meaning to the expression "far from being a stabilizer state". The caveat is of course an important one. Many things are unknown in higher dimensions, including even the existence of Alltop MUBs in even prime power dimensions larger than four, and the existence of SICs in three digit dimensions and larger. Moreover a truly satisfactory picture requires further study also for the dimensions we do study. We have not discussed maximal mana states, or more generally how the states we have discussed sit relative to the set of mixed states with positive Wigner function. This set plays a special role in quantum computation. We hope to address some of these issues in the future.

Acknowledgement:
We thank Adán Cabello for an analysis of the graph given in Fig. 4, and Marcus Appleby for many discussions.

References

[1] D. Gross, *Hudson's theorem for finite-dimensional quantum systems*, J. Math. Phys. **47** (2006) 122107.

[2] V. Veitch, C. Ferrie, D. Gross, and J. Emerson, *Negative quasi-probability as a resource for quantum computation*, New J. Phys. **14** (2012) 113011.

[3] S. Bandyopadhyay, P. O. Boykin, V. Roychowdhury and F. Vatan, *A new proof for the existence of mutually unbiased bases*, Algorithmica **34** (2002) 512.

[4] S. Bravyi and A. Kitaev, *Universal quantum computation with ideal Clifford gates and noisy ancillas*, Phys. Rev. **A71** (2005) 022316.

[5] E. T. Campbell, H. Anwar, and D. E. Browne, *Magic state distillation in all prime dimensions using quantum Reed-Muller codes*, Phys. Rev. **X2** (2012) 041021.

[6] M. Howard and J. Vala, *Qudit versions of the qubit "pi-over-eight" gate*, Phys. Rev. **A86** (2012) 022316.

[7] W. O. Alltop, *Complex sequences with low periodic correlations*, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **26** (1980) 350.

[8] A. Klappenecker and M. Rötteler, *Constructions of Mutually Unbiased Bases*, in Proc. 7th Int. Conf. on Finite Fields, Toulouse, France, LNCS, Springer 2004.

[9] K. Blanchfield, *Orbits of mutually unbiased bases*, J. Phys. **A47** (2014) 135303.

[10] G. Zauner: *Quantendesigns. Grundzüge einer nichtkommutativen Designtheorie*, PhD thesis, Univ. Wien 1999. Available in English translation in Int. J. Quant. Inf. **9** (2011) 445.

[11] J. M. Renes, R. Blume-Kohout, A. J. Scott, and C. M. Caves, *Symmetric informationally complete quantum measurements*, J. Math. Phys. **45** (2004) 2171.

[12] D. M. Appleby, *SIC-POVMs and the extended Clifford group*, J. Math. Phys. **46**, 052107 (2005).

[13] A. J. Scott and M. Grassl, *SIC-POVMs: A new computer study*, J. Math. Phys. **51** (2010) 042203.

[14] F. Szöllősi, *All complex equiangular tight frames in dimension 3*, eprint arXiv:1402.6429.

[15] L. Hughston and S. Salamon, *Surveying points in the complex projective plane*, eprint arXiv:1410.5862.

[16] U. Larsen, *Superspace geometry; the exact uncertainty relationship between complementary aspects*, J. Phys. **A23** (1990) 1041.

[17] W. K. Wootters and D. M. Sussman, *Discrete phase space and minimum-uncertainty states*, eprint quant-ph/0704.1277.

[18] D. M. Appleby, *SIC-POVMs and MUBs: Geometrical relationships in prime dimensions*, in L. Accardi et al (eds.): Proc of the Växjö Conference on Foundations of Probability and Physics - 5, AIP Conf. Proc. 1101, New York 2009.

[19] I. Amburg, R. Sharma, D. Sussman and W.K. Wootters, *States that "look the same" with respect to every basis in a mutually unbiased set*, eprint arXiv:1407.4074.

[20] U. Seyfarth, L. L. Sanchez-Soto, and G. Leuchs, *Structure of the sets of mutually unbiased bases with cyclic symmetry*, eprint arXiv:1404.3035.

[21] D. M. Appleby, I. Bengtsson, and H. B. Dang, *Galois unitaries and mutually unbiased bases*, to appear.

[22] M. Wieśniak, T. Paterek, and A. Zeilinger, *Entanglement in mutually unbiased bases*, New J. Phys. **13** (2011) 053047.

[23] M. Howard, J. J. Vallman, V. Veitch, and J. Emerson, *Contextuality supplies the magic for quantum computation*, Nature **510** (2014) 351.

[24] D. M. Appleby, H. B. Dang, and C. A. Fuchs, *Symmetric Informationally-Complete quantum states as analogues to orthonormal bases and Minimum Uncertainty States*, Entropy **16** (2014) 1484.

[25] H. Zhu, *SIC-POVMs and Clifford groups in prime dimensions*, J. Phys. **A43** (2010) 305305.

[26] D. Andersson: *An Enthusiast's Guide to SICs in Low Dimensions*, MSc thesis, Stockholm University 2014.

[27] I. Bengtsson, K. Blanchfield, E. T. Campbell, and M. Howard, *Order 3 symmetry in the Clifford hierarchy*, J. Phys. **A47** (2014) 455302.

[28] V. Veitch, S. A. H. Mousavian, D. Gottesman, and J. Emerson, *The resource theory of stabilizer computation*, New J. Phys. **16** (2014) 013009.

[29] D. M. Appleby and G. N. M. Tabia, unpublished.

[30] J. J. Benedetto and M. Fickus, *Finite normalized tight frames*, Adv. Comp. Math. **18** (2003) 357.

[31] M. Khaterinejad, *On Weyl-Heisenberg orbits of equiangular lines*, J. Algebra. Comb. **28** (2008) 333.

[32] I. Bengtsson and H. Granström, *The frame potential, on average*, Open Sys. Inf. Dyn. **16** (2009) 145.

[33] A. B. Klimov, J. L. Romero, G. Björk, and L. L. Sanchez-Soto, *Geometrical approach to mutually unbiased bases*, J. Phys. **A40** (2007) 3987.

[34] S. G. Hoggar, *64 lines from a quaternionic polytope*, Geom. Dedic. **69** (1998) 287.

[35] C. Godsil and A. Roy, *Equiangular lines, mutually unbiased bases, and spin models*, Eur. J. Comb. **30** (2009) 246.